Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Doris grandiflora* Rapp, 1827 (currently *Dendrodoris grandiflora*; Mollusca, Gastropoda)

(Case 2886; see BZN **51**: 7–9)

Richard C. Willan
Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory, G.P.O. Box 4646, Darwin, Northern Territory 0810, Australia

Robert Burn
3 Nantes Street, Newtown, Geelong, Victoria 3220, Australia

In supporting the proposal by Ortea & Valdés to conserve the specific name of the Mediterranean dendrodorid nudibranch *Doris grandiflora* Rapp, 1827 over that of its senior subjective synonym *Doris guttata* Risso, 1826, we acknowledge that *grandiflora* has gained universal acceptance. This is demonstrated by its usage not only in all of the specialist taxonomic and biochemical literature, but importantly also in both the definitive modern regional guides (Schmekel & Portmann, 1982; Cattaneo-Vietti, Chemello & Giannuzzi-Savelli, 1990).

Furthermore, we wish to point out that if *Dendrodoris guttata* (Risso, 1826) were treated as a valid name it would be a senior secondary homonym of *Doridopsis guttata* Odhner, 1917. *Doridopsis* is a junior subjective synonym of *Dendrodoris*.

Dendrodoris guttata (Odhner) is a very distinctive species (one of the few Indo-Pacific species to be readily identifiable) that occurs in Japan and throughout the northern half of Australia from Coffs Harbour in northern New South Wales, across the entire northern coast, to Warroora in central Western Australia. It is included in two of the guides to the Australian nudibranch fauna (Willan & Coleman, 1984; Coleman, 1990). Crucially, there are no junior synonyms, so a new name would need to be created if *guttata* Risso, 1826 were to replace *grandiflora* Rapp, 1827 in *Dendrodoris*. We have supplied the Commission Secretariat with a list of 11 works that indicate the acceptance of the name *Dendrodoris guttata* (Odhner, 1917) in Australian and Japanese technical and popular literature.

Additional references

Coleman, N. 1990. *Nudibranchs of the South Pacific*, vol. 1. 64 pp. Neville Coleman's Sea Resource Centre, Springwood, Queensland.

Odhner, N.H. 1917. Results of Dr E. Mjöberg's Swedish Scientific Expeditions to Australia 1910–1913. XVII. Mollusca. *Kungliga Svenska Vetenskaps Akademiens Handligar*, **52**(19): 1–115.

Willan, R.C. & Coleman, N. 1984. *Nudibranchs of Australasia*. 56 pp. Australasian Marine Photographic Index, Sydney.

Comment on the proposed conservation as the correct spelling of *Cryptophagus* Herbst, 1792, *Dorcatoma* Herbst, 1792, *Rhizophagus* Herbst, 1793 and *Colon* Herbst, 1797 and the proposed conservation of *Lyctus bipustulatus* Fabricius, 1792 as the type species of *Rhizophagus* (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 2783; see BZN **51**: 21–24)

R.G. Booth

International Institute of Entomology, c/o The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

I would like to add my support for this case. Several species of *Cryptophagus* occur as pests in stored products in northern temperate regions, and the name is well used in the economic literature. The RHIZOPHAGIDAE are a small but well defined family of worldwide distribution. One species of *Rhizophagus* has been used as a biological control agent of an important forestry pest in the U.K. (King, C.J. & Fielding, N.J. 1989. *Bulletin of the Forestry Commission*, London, **85**, 1–11).

Although Silfverberg quotes Illiger (1801) and Paykull (1800) as the first users of *Colon* and *Cryptophagus* respectively, both names appear in the index of Herbst's own work (Herbst, 1799, *Natursystem* ..., part 8, p. 395). As the names appear in the correct alphabetic order, Herbst's change from K... to C... must have been deliberate.

Similarly, *Dorcatoma* was used by Paykull ([1798], *Fauna Svecica* (Insecta), vol. 1, p. 318) before Fabricius (1801). However, close inspection of Herbst (1792, pp. 103–105) reveals an interesting variant in spelling. While *Dorkatoma* was used as a heading on pages 103, 104 and 105, the diagnosis (p. 104) of '1. Dorkatoma Dresdensis' reads 'Mus. Herbst. Dorc. atra, glabra, antennis pedibusque piceis.'. 'Dorc.' can be accepted either as an abbreviation for *Dorcatoma* or as a typographical error. It was common practice to use the generic name or its abbreviation at the start of a latin diagnosis of a species name, and Herbst used abbreviations throughout the work in question. The application to conserve *Dorcatoma* as the original spelling may be unnecessary if the Commission accepts that *Dorcatoma*, as appearing in the abbreviation 'Dorc.' in the diagnosis, is a valid alternative original spelling to *Dorkatoma*.

Comment on the proposed conservation of ELMIDAE Curtis, 1830 as the correct spelling and of the feminine gender of *Elmis* Latreille, 1802 (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 2861; see BZN **51**: 25–27)

G.N. Foster

Honorary Secretary, The Balfour-Browne Club, 3 Eglinton Terrace, Ayr KA7 1JJ, Scotland, U.K.

I wish to support Dr Manfred Jäch's proposal to conserve ELMIDAE as the correct spelling of the riffle beetle family name, at the same time retaining the feminine gender of the name *Elmis*. The riffle beetles are an important, worldwide group of beetles often cited as indicators of water quality by limnologists. The proposal to use the name ELMIDIDAE has not received much support; I am only aware of the two Swedish papers cited by Jäch. Names such as HELMIDAE and ELMINTHIDAE, both apparently unavailable, have occasionally been used in ecological literature, resulting in potential confusion. Removal of this uncertainty will be beneficial to all those involved in the study of water beetles.